

Fourier analysis and large independent sets in powers of complete graphs.

Mahya Ghandehari^a and Hamed Hatami^b

^a*Department of Pure Mathematics*

University of Waterloo

^b*Department of Computer Science*

University of Toronto

Abstract

For constant r and arbitrary n , it was known that in the graph K_r^n any independent set of size close to the maximum is close to some independent set of maximum size. We prove that this statement holds for arbitrary r and n .

AMS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION: 05C69

KEYWORDS: independent sets, weak product, Fourier analysis, Harmonic analysis.

1 Introduction

The *weak product* of G and H , denoted by $G \times H$ is defined as follows: The vertex set of $G \times H$ is the Cartesian product of the vertex sets of G and H . Two vertices (g_1, h_1) and (g_2, h_2) are adjacent in $G \times H$ if g_1g_2 is an edge of G and h_1h_2 is an edge of H .

In this paper we consider the product of complete graphs on $r > 2$ vertices,

$$G = K_r^n = \times_{j=1}^n K_r.$$

We identify the vertices of G with the elements of $\mathbb{Z}_r^n$. By the definition of product, two vertices are adjacent in G iff the corresponding vectors differ in every coordinate.

Let $0 \leq i \leq r - 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$ be two fixed integers. It is obvious that the set of all vertices of G which has i in the j th coordinate forms an independent set. In fact, for $r > 2$, these sets are the only maximum independent sets of G [11]. A generalization of this result has been shown in [1] through the following Theorem:

Theorem A. [1] *For every $r \geq 3$, there exists a constant $M = M(r)$ such that for any $\epsilon > 0$ the following is true. Let $G = K_r^n$ and J be an independent set such that $\frac{|J|}{|G|} = \frac{1}{r}(1 - \epsilon)$. Then there exists an independent set I with $\frac{|I|}{|G|} = \frac{1}{r}$ such that $\frac{|J \Delta I|}{|G|} < \frac{M\epsilon}{r}$.*

In Theorem A, “ Δ ” denotes the symmetric difference. Theorem A asserts that any independent set which is close to being of maximum size is close to being determined by one coordinate. The function $M(r)$ that is obtained in [1] depends on r . When r is a constant, for every constant $\delta > 0$ one can choose ϵ to be a sufficiently small constant so that $\frac{|J \Delta I|}{|G|} < \frac{\delta}{r}$. But when r tends to infinity, to obtain any nontrivial result from Theorem A, ϵ must be less than $\frac{1}{M(r)}$ which is not a constant. The main result of this paper is to show that in Theorem A, M does not need to be a function of r . Note that this major improvement makes Theorem A as powerful for large values of r as for constant r . We formalize this in the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *Let $G = K_r^n$, $r \geq 20$ and $\epsilon < 10^{-9}$. Suppose that J is an independent set of G such that $\frac{|J|}{|G|} = \frac{1}{r}(1 - \epsilon)$. Then there exists an independent set I with $\frac{|I|}{|G|} = \frac{1}{r}$ such that $\frac{|J \Delta I|}{|G|} < \frac{40\epsilon}{r}$.*

Remark 2 Note that for $\epsilon \geq 10^{-9}$, we have the trivial bound $\frac{|J \Delta I|}{|G|} \leq \frac{2 \times 10^9 \epsilon}{r}$, where I is an arbitrary independent set. We also assumed that $r \geq 20$, for some technical reasons. However one can use Theorem A when $r < 20$, as $M(r)$ is a constant for those values of r .

Let I be a maximum independent set of $G = K_r^n$, and J be an independent set of G such that $J \not\subseteq I$. Then obviously, $\frac{|I \setminus J|}{|G|} \geq \frac{(r-1)^{n-1}}{r^n}$. So we obtain the following as a corollary of Theorem 1.

Corollary 3 *Let $G = K_r^n$, $r \geq 20$ and $\epsilon < c$ where $c = \min(10^{-9}, (1 - \frac{1}{r})^{n-1})/40$. Let J be an independent set such that $\frac{|J|}{|G|} = \frac{1}{r}(1 - \epsilon)$. Then there exists an independent set I with $\frac{|I|}{|G|} = \frac{1}{r}$ such that $J \subseteq I$.*

Note that if in Corollary 3, $r > c'n$ for some constant c' , then one can take c to be a constant that does not depend on n .

The proof of Theorem 1 as well as Theorem A is based on Fourier analysis on the group $\mathbb{Z}_r^n$. Fourier analysis has been shown to be very useful in the study of Boolean functions. One can refer to [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17] to see some examples. In order to prove Theorem 1 we show that a Boolean function

which has most of its 2-norm weight concentrated on the first two levels¹ of its Fourier expansion is close to being determined by one coordinate. Thus Lemma 5 which formulates this might be of independent interest as a result in the direction of extending results of [10, 7, 13] from $\mathbb{Z}_2^n$ to $\mathbb{Z}_r^n$.

Section 2 is devoted to a very brief introduction to Fourier analysis of $\mathbb{Z}_r^n$ and introducing notations and some of the necessary tools. In Section 3 we give the proof of Theorem 1. Section 4 contains some possible directions for future work.

2 Background

We refer the reader to [1] for a nice and brief introduction to Fourier analysis of $\mathbb{Z}_r^n$. In the following we recall some basic facts and introduce some notations.

Let $r > 2$ and $G = \{0, 1, \dots, r-1\}^n = \mathbb{Z}_r^n$. For any $S \in G$, let S_i denote the i th coordinate of S . We also think of G as probability space endowed with the uniform (product) measure μ .

For any $S \in G$ let $u_S : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be defined by

$$u_S(T) = \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i \sum_{i=1}^n S_i T_i}{r}\right).$$

It is well-known that the set of all functions u_S ($S \in G$) forms an orthonormal basis for the space of all functions $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Therefore any such f has a unique expansion of the form $f = \sum \widehat{f}(S) u_S$, where

$$\widehat{f}(S) = \langle f, u_S \rangle = \int f(T) \cdot \overline{u_S(T)} \mu(dT).$$

For any function $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, define the p -norm of f as

$$\|f\|_p = \left(\int |f(S)|^p \mu(dT) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

From orthogonality it can be easily seen that

$$\|f\|_2^2 = \sum_{S \in G} \widehat{f}(S)^2$$

and

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \sum \widehat{f}(S) \overline{\widehat{g}(S)}.$$

We use the following notations throughout the paper: For every complex number z , let $d(z, \{0, 1\}) = \min(|z|, |z-1|)$ denote its distance from the nearest element

¹Defined formally below

in $\{0, 1\}$. For any $S \in G$ let $|S| = |\{i : S_i \neq 0\}|$. $\bar{0} = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$, and for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ let $e_i = (0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0)$ be the unit vector with 1 at i th coordinate. Define F_S as $F_S = \hat{f}(S)u_S$. Let $f^{>k} = \sum_{|S|>k} F_S$ (similarly $f^{<k} = \sum_{|S|<k} F_S$) and $f^{=k} = \sum_{|S|=k} F_S$. We occasionally refer to $f^{=k}$ the k -th level of Fourier expansion of f . Note that for any function f , $\hat{f}(\bar{0})$ is the expectation of f , and $\|f^{\geq 1}\|_2^2$ is the variance of f .

The following version of Bennett's Inequality which can be easily obtained from the one stated in [6] will be used in the proof of Lemma 5 below.

Theorem 4 (Bennett's Inequality) *Let $X_1, \dots, X_n$ be independent real-valued random variables with zero mean, and assume that $X_i \leq c$ with probability one. Let*

$$\sigma^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}[X_i].$$

Then for any $t > 0$,

$$\Pr\left[\sum X_i \geq t\right] \leq e^{-\frac{\sigma^2}{c^2} h\left(\frac{tc}{\sigma^2}\right)},$$

where $h(u) = (1+u) \ln(1+u) - u$ for $u \geq 0$.

3 Main results.

In [7, 10, 13] results of the following type have been proven: Let f be a Boolean function on $\mathbb{Z}_2^n$ and $f^{>k}$ is sufficiently small for some constant k , then f is close to being determined by a few number of coordinates. The following lemma which is the key lemma in the proof of Theorem 1 is a result of this type for $\mathbb{Z}_r^n$.

Lemma 5 *Let $f : \mathbb{Z}_r^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a Boolean function such that $\|f^{=1}\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{r}$ and $\|f^{>1}\|_2^2 \leq \epsilon$, where $\epsilon < \frac{1}{10^8 r}$ and $r \geq 20$. Then denoting by $1 \leq i_0 \leq n$ the index such that $\sum_{j=1}^{r-1} |\hat{f}(je_{i_0})|^2$ is maximized, we have*

$$\left\| f - \left(\hat{f}(\bar{0}) + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} F_{je_{i_0}} \right) \right\|_2^2 < 5\epsilon.$$

Remark 6 Lemma 5 shows that f is close to a function which depends only on the i_0 -th coordinate. We do not know if the condition $\|f^{=1}\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{r}$ is a weakness of our proof or it is essential. The condition $\epsilon < \frac{1}{10^8 r}$ is not a major weakness, since for $\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{10^8 r}$, we have the trivial bound of $(10^8 + 1)\epsilon$.

We postpone the proof of Lemma 5 until Section 3.1. We now give the proof of Theorem 1, assuming Lemma 5.

Proof.[Theorem 1] Let J be an independent set of G such that $\frac{|J|}{|G|} = \frac{1}{r}(1 - \epsilon)$. Let f be the characteristic function of J . Then according to the proof of Theorem A (Theorem 1.2 in [1]), we have

$$\|f^{>1}\|_2^2 = \sum_{|S|>1} |\widehat{f}(S)|^2 \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{r}.$$

Since

$$\|f^{=1}\|_2^2 \leq \|f\|_2^2 = \mu(J) \leq \frac{1}{r},$$

by Lemma 5, there exists a function $g : \mathbb{Z}_r^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which depends on one coordinate and $\|f - g\|_2^2 \leq \frac{10\epsilon}{r}$. By rounding g to the nearest of 0 or 1, we get a Boolean function g_1 which depends on one coordinate, and since f is Boolean

$$\|f - g_1\|_2^2 \leq 4\|f - g\|_2^2 \leq \frac{40\epsilon}{r}.$$

■

3.1 Proof of Lemma 5

The proof of Lemma 5 shares similar ideas with the proof of Theorem 8 in [13]. However dealing with (complex) Fourier expansions on $\mathbb{Z}_r^n$ instead of (real) generalized Walsh expansions on $\mathbb{Z}_2^n$ required new ideas.

For any function f , denote $\widehat{f}(S)u_S$ by F_S to make the notations easier. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $g_i = \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} F_{je_i}$, and define $g_0 = \widehat{f}(\bar{0})$. For $0 \leq i \leq n$ let $a_i = \|g_i\|_2$. Without loss of generality assume that $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_n$. To obtain

$$\|f - (g_0 + g_1)\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=2}^n a_i^2 + \|f^{>1}\|_2^2 \leq 5\epsilon,$$

we will first show that a_2 is small (Claim 7). This would allow us to apply a concentration theorem and conclude that $\sum_{i=2}^n a_i^2$ is very small (Claim 8).

First note that

$$\|f^{=1}\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 \leq \frac{1}{r},$$

which implies that $a_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{2r}$. Now since $\|g_2\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{2r}$, for every $0 \leq x_2 \leq r-1$,

$$|g_2(x_2)| \leq \sqrt{1/2}. \quad (1)$$

Claim 7 $a_2^2 < 2000\epsilon$.

Proof. Consider an arbitrary assignment $\delta_1, \delta_3, \dots, \delta_n$ to $x_1, x_3, \dots, x_n$, and let

$$l = \widehat{f}(\overline{0}) + g_1(\delta_1) + \sum_{i=3}^n g_i(\delta_i).$$

Since for every $0 \leq x_2 \leq r-1$,

$$d(l, \{0, 1\}) \leq |g_2(x_2)| + d(l + g_2(x_2), \{0, 1\}),$$

we have

$$\|d(l, \{0, 1\})\|_2^2 \leq 2(\|g_2\|_2^2 + \|d(l + g_2, \{0, 1\})\|_2^2),$$

or equivalently

$$d(l, \{0, 1\})^2 \leq 2(a_2^2 + \|d(l + g_2, \{0, 1\})\|_2^2). \quad (2)$$

Note that

$$\|d(f^{\leq 1}, \{0, 1\})\|_2^2 \leq 2(\|d(f, \{0, 1\})\|_2^2 + \|f^{>1}\|_2^2) \leq 2\epsilon.$$

Therefore we can find an assignment $\delta_1, \delta_3, \dots, \delta_n$ such that

$$\|d(l + g_2, \{0, 1\})\|_2^2 \leq 2\epsilon. \quad (3)$$

By (2) for any such assignment, we have $d(l, \{0, 1\})^2 \leq \frac{1}{r} + 4\epsilon \leq 1/16$, which implies either $|l| \leq \frac{1}{4}$ or $|l-1| \leq \frac{1}{4}$.

Define $\lambda = \frac{1 - \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4}}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4}}}$. Now (1) implies that for any $0 \leq x_2 \leq r-1$,

Case 1: If $|l| < \frac{1}{4}$, then $|(l + g_2(x_2)) - 1| \geq \lambda|l + g_2(x_2)|$.

Case 2: If $|l-1| < \frac{1}{4}$, then $|l + g_2(x_2)| \geq \lambda|(l + g_2(x_2)) - 1|$.

Let $A = \{x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_r : |l + g_2(x_2)| \leq |l + g_2(x_2) - 1|\}$ and denote its complement by $\overline{A}$. Representing $\|d(l + g_2, \{0, 1\})\|_2^2$ as a sum of two integrals over A and $\overline{A}$, and using (1), in Cases 1 and 2 one can show that

$$\|d(l + g_2, \{0, 1\})\|_2^2 \geq \lambda^2 \|g_2\|_2^2 > \frac{a_2^2}{1000}.$$

Note that the assumption $a_2^2 \geq 2000\epsilon$ will imply $\|d(l + g_2, \{0, 1\})\|_2^2 > 2\epsilon$ which contradicts (3). Thus $a_2^2 < 2000\epsilon$. ■

Claim 8 $\sum_{i=2}^n a_i^2 \leq 4\epsilon$.

Proof. Let $2 \leq m \leq n$ be the minimum index which satisfies

$$\sum_{i=m}^n a_i^2 \leq 10^4 \epsilon. \quad (4)$$

Denote $I = \{m, \dots, n\}$, and for every $y \in \mathbb{Z}_r^{m-1}$ let $f_{I[y]}^*$ be a function of $\mathbb{Z}_r^{n-m+1}$ (with uniform measure μ') defined as

$$f_{I[y]}^*(x) = f^{\leq 1}(y \cup x).$$

Obviously

$$\int \|d(f_{I[y]}^*(x), \{0, 1\})\|_2^2 \mu'(dy) = \|d(f^{\leq 1}, \{0, 1\})\|_2^2 \leq 2\epsilon.$$

Hence for some y , $\|d(f_{I[y]}^*(x), \{0, 1\})\|_2^2 \leq 2\epsilon$. Let $b = \widehat{f}(\bar{0}) + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} g_i(y_i)$. Then

$$f_{I[y]}^*(x) = b + \sum_{i=m}^n g_i(x_i).$$

Applying Lemma 9 below to $f_{I[y]}^*$ for $\epsilon' = 2\epsilon$ shows that $\sum_{i=m}^n a_i^2 \leq 4\epsilon$. This will imply that $m = 2$, as $a_2^2 < 2000\epsilon$ and m was the minimum index satisfying (4), which completes the proof. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 9 *Let $f : \mathbb{Z}_r^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function satisfying $f^{>1} \equiv 0$. Let $\|d(f, \{0, 1\})\|_2^2 \leq \epsilon'$, and suppose that $\|f^{=1}\|_2^2 < 10^4 \epsilon'$ and $\epsilon' < \frac{2}{10^8 r}$. Then we have*

$$\|f^{=1}\|_2^2 < 2\epsilon'.$$

Proof. Suppose that $f = b + \sum_{i=1}^n g_i$, where $b = \widehat{f}(\bar{0})$ and $g_i = \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} F_{j e_i}$. We have

$$\|d(b, \{0, 1\})\|_2^2 \leq 2(\|d(f, \{0, 1\})\|_2^2 + \|f - b\|_2^2) \leq 20002\epsilon'.$$

Without loss of generality assume that $d(b, 1) \leq \sqrt{20002\epsilon'}$ which implies that

$$\operatorname{Re}(b) > 2/3. \quad (5)$$

We have

$$\|f - 1\|_2^2 - \|d(f, \{0, 1\})\|_2^2 = \int (|f - 1|^2 - |f|^2) \zeta dx,$$

where

$$\zeta(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \operatorname{Re}(f(x)) < \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

So

$$\|f - 1\|_2^2 - \|d(f, \{0, 1\})\|_2^2 = \int (1 - 2\operatorname{Re}(f))\zeta dx. \quad (6)$$

The next step is to show that (6) is less than ϵ' . Note that $\operatorname{Re}(f) = \operatorname{Re}(b) + \sum_{i=1}^n \operatorname{Re}(g_i)$, and $\int \operatorname{Re}(g_i) = 0$. Moreover

$$\int \operatorname{Re}(g_i)^2 = \|\operatorname{Re}(g_i)\|_2^2 \leq \|g_i\|_2^2.$$

So

$$\|\operatorname{Re}(g_i)\|_2^2 \leq \sum \|g_i\|_2^2 \leq 10^4 \epsilon'$$

which follows that for every x ,

$$|\operatorname{Re}(g_i(x))| \leq \sqrt{10^4 r \epsilon'} \leq \sqrt{2} \times 10^{-2} \doteq c.$$

Applying Theorem 4 with $X_i = -\operatorname{Re}(g_i)$, we get

$$\Pr[\sum \operatorname{Re}(g_i) \leq -t] \leq e^{\frac{-10^4 \epsilon'}{c^2} h(10^{-4} tc / \epsilon')}. \quad (7)$$

Note that $h(u) \geq u \ln(\frac{u}{e})$, for $u \geq e$; which implies that for $t \geq \frac{1}{6} \geq 10^4 e \epsilon' / c$,

$$\Pr[\sum \operatorname{Re}(g_i) \leq -t] \leq e^{-\frac{t}{c} \ln(10^{-4} tc / e \epsilon')}. \quad (8)$$

Now

$$(6) = \int_{t=0}^{\infty} \Pr[1 - 2\operatorname{Re}(f) > t] = \int_{t=0}^{\infty} \Pr\left[\operatorname{Re}(b) + \sum \operatorname{Re}(g_i) < \frac{1-t}{2}\right].$$

Substituting (5) we get

$$(6) \leq \int_{t=0}^{\infty} \Pr\left[\sum \operatorname{Re}(g_i) < \frac{1-t}{2} - \frac{2}{3}\right] \leq 2 \int_{t=1/6}^{\infty} \Pr\left[\sum \operatorname{Re}(g_i) < -t\right].$$

Now by (8)

$$\begin{aligned} (6) &\leq 2 \int_{t=1/6}^{\infty} e^{\frac{t}{c} \ln(10^4 e \epsilon' / tc)} \leq 2 \int_{t=1/6}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1 - \ln(10^4 e \epsilon' / tc)}{c} \right) e^{\frac{t}{c} \ln(10^4 e \epsilon' / tc)} = \\ &= 2e^{\frac{1}{6c} \ln(6 \times 10^4 e \epsilon' / c)} < \epsilon', \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

because $\epsilon' \leq 10^{-8}$. Finally by (9)

$$\|f^{-1}\|_2^2 \leq \|f - 1\|_2^2 \leq \|d(f, \{0, 1\})\|_2^2 + \epsilon' \leq 2\epsilon'.$$

■

4 Future Directions

Lemma 5 asserts that when most of the 2-norm weight of the Fourier expansion of a Boolean function on $\mathbb{Z}_r^n$ is concentrated on the first two levels, then the function can be approximated by a Boolean function that depends on only one coordinate. One possible generalization of this lemma would be to show that a Boolean function on $\mathbb{Z}_r^n$ whose Fourier expansion is concentrated on the first l levels for some constant l can be approximated by a Boolean function that depends on $k(l)$ coordinates, for some function $k(l)$. Analogues of this for $\mathbb{Z}_2^n$ have been proven in [7] and [13].

Consider a graph G whose vertices are the elements of the symmetric group S_n and two vertices π and π' are adjacent if $\pi(i) \neq \pi'(i)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. For every $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ the set S_{ij} of the vertices π satisfying $\pi(i) = j$ forms an independent set of size $(n-1)!$. Recently Cameron and Ku [8] have proved that these sets are the only maximum independent sets of this graph. Similar results have been proven for generalizations of this graph in [14]. Cameron and Ku made the following conjecture:

Conjecture B. [8] *There is a constant c such that every independent set of size at least $c(n-1)!$ is a subset of an independent set of size $(n-1)!$.*

One might notice the similarity of Conjecture B and Corollary 3 for $r = n$. Despite this similarity we are not aware of any possible way to apply the techniques used in this paper to the problem. Since S_n is not Abelian, the methods of the present paper (and all the papers mentioned in Section 1) fail to apply directly to this problem. So an answer to Conjecture B or its analogues for the graphs studied in [14] (which do not even have a group structure) might lead to new techniques.

References

- [1] N. ALON, I. DINUR, E. FRIEDGUT, AND B. SUDAKOV, *Graph products, Fourier analysis and spectral techniques*, Geom. Funct. Anal., 14 (2004), pp. 913–940.
- [2] N. ALON, G. KALAI, M. RICKLIN, AND L. STOCKMEYER, *Lower bounds on the competitive ratio for mobile user tracking and distributed job scheduling*, Theoret. Comput. Sci., 130 (1994), pp. 175–201.
- [3] N. ALON, N. LINIAL, AND R. MESHULAM, *Additive bases of vector spaces over prime fields*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A, 57 (1991), pp. 203–210.
- [4] R. C. BAKER AND W. M. SCHMIDT, *Diophantine problems in variables restricted to the values 0 and 1*, J. Number Theory, 12 (1980), pp. 460–486.

- [5] I. BENJAMINI, G. KALAI, AND O. SCHRAMM, *Noise sensitivity of Boolean functions and applications to percolation*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math., (1999), pp. 5–43 (2001).
- [6] S. BOUCHERON, O. BOUSQUET, AND G. LUGOSI, *Concentration inequalities*, in Advanced Lectures in Machine Learning, Springer, 2004, pp. 208–240.
- [7] J. BOURGAIN, *On the distributions of the Fourier spectrum of Boolean functions*, Israel J. Math., 131 (2002), pp. 269–276.
- [8] P. J. CAMERON AND C. Y. KU, *Intersecting families of permutations*, European J. Combin., 24 (2003), pp. 881–890.
- [9] E. FRIEDGUT, *Boolean functions with low average sensitivity depend on few coordinates*, Combinatorica, 18 (1998), pp. 27–35.
- [10] E. FRIEDGUT, G. KALAI, AND A. NAOR, *Boolean functions whose Fourier transform is concentrated on the first two levels*, Adv. in Appl. Math., 29 (2002), pp. 427–437.
- [11] D. GREENWELL AND L. LOVÁSZ, *Applications of product colorings*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar., 25 (1978), pp. 335–340.
- [12] J. KAHN, G. KALAI, AND N. LINIAL, *The influence of variables on boolean functions*, in 29-th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 1988, pp. 68–80.
- [13] G. KINDLER AND S. SAFRA, *Noise-resistant boolean-functions are juntas*, preprint.
- [14] B. LAROSE AND C. MALVENUTO, *Stable sets of maximal size in Kneser-type graphs*, European J. Combin., 25 (2004), pp. 657–673.
- [15] N. LINIAL, Y. MANSOUR, AND N. NISAN, *Constant depth circuits, Fourier transform, and learnability*, J. Assoc. Comput. Mach., 40 (1993), pp. 607–620.
- [16] R. MESHULAM, *On subsets of finite abelian groups with no 3-term arithmetic progressions*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A, 71 (1995), pp. 168–172.
- [17] M. TALAGRAND, *On boundaries and influences*, Combinatorica, 17 (1997), pp. 275–285.